



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/826,468	04/16/2004	Peter Linhardt	20423-08701	1485
34415 7590 07/18/2008 SYMANTEC/FENWICK SILICON VALLEY CENTER 801 CALIFORNIA STREET MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041				
EXAMINER GREENE, JOSEPH L				
ART UNIT 2151		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 07/18/2008		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ptoc@fenwick.com  
bhoffman@fenwick.com  
aprice@fenwick.com

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/826,468

**Applicant(s)**

LINHARDT, PETER

**Examiner**

JOSEPH L. GREENE

**Art Unit**

2151

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 April 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1 – 22 are currently pending in this application.
2. Claims 1, 5, 7, 9-10, 15-19, and 21 are amended as filed on 04/22/2008.
3. Claim 22 is new as filed on 04/22/2008.
4. Claims 4, 14, and 20 are canceled as filed on 04/22/2008.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. **Claims 1, 9-10, 18-19, and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Moore et al. (Patent No. US 7,000,015 B2), hereinafter Moore.**
7. With respect to claim 1, Moore disclosed a method for associating computer network identifications with network policies (column 17, lines 4-7), said method comprising the steps of: analyzing a network interface associated with a client computer

using a plurality of network detectors (column 13, lines 28-34, 38-44, where the NLRSP is not a single entity, rather, it is a set of services that combined form the plurality of network detectors. Furthermore, analysis is required to perform the functions of the NLRSP), the detectors outputting a set of netspecs (column 14, lines 61-66, where the set of netspecs is the GUID and the other information that applications frequently need), each netspec comprising a first token identifying a detector used for the analysis (column 14, lines 61-66, where the GUID is discovered by the first token according to the first token's description found in the applicant's specification on page 5) and a second token identifying the analyzed network interface (column 14, lines 61-66, where the other information is determined from the second token. Also, see column 16, lines 27-29, which shows that detecting an IP address is part of the NLRSP in accordance with the applicant's specification on page 5); associating the network identifications made by the netspecs with locations (column 13, lines 43-44) and feeding associated network identification/ locations pairs (column 13, lines 59-67 to column 14, line 1) to a network interface module to implement desired network policies (column 13, lines 28-34).

8. As for claim 9, Moore disclosed all of the limitations described in claim 1, including wherein the step of feeding the associated network identification/location (column 13, lines 59-67 to column 14, line 1) pairs to a network interface module comprises using a policy guide to feed the network identification/location pairs to the network interface module on a real-time basis (column 13, lines 38-42).

9. With respect to claim 10, Moore disclosed an apparatus for associating computer network identifications with network policies (column 17, lines 4-7), said apparatus comprising the steps of: analyzing a network interface associated with a client computer using a plurality of network detectors (column 13, lines 28-34, 38-44, where the NLRSP is not a single entity, rather, it is a set of services that combined form the plurality of network detectors. Furthermore, analysis is required to perform the functions of the NLRSP), the detectors outputting a set of netspecs (column 14, lines 61-66, where the set of netspecs is the GUID and the other information that applications frequently need), each netspec comprising a first token identifying a detector used for the analysis (column 14, lines 61-66, where the GUID is discovered by the first token according to the first token's description found in the applicant's specification on page 5) and a second token identifying the analyzed network interface (column 14, lines 61-66, where the other information is determined from the second token. Also, see column 16, lines 27-29, which shows that detecting an IP address is part of the NLRSP in accordance with the applicant's specification on page 5); coupled to the analyzing means, means for associating the network identifications made by the netspecs with locations (column 13, lines 43-44) and feeding associated network identification/ locations pairs (column 13, lines 59-67 to column 14, line 1) to a network interface module to implement desired network policies (column 13, lines 28-34).

10. As for claim 18, Moore disclosed all of the limitations described in claim 10, including wherein the feeding means comprises: a policy guide for associating the network identifications with the locations (column 13, lines 59-67 to column 14, line 1, where the policy guide is inherent to unique naming); wherein the network interface module implements the network policies based upon the locations fed to the network interface module by the policy guide (column 13, lines 28-34).

11. As for claim 19, Moore disclosed all of the limitations described in claim 10, including coupled to the network interface module, a user interface adapted to enable a user of the client computer to associate the locations with the network policies (column 17, lines 4-7, furthermore, it is implicit that if a user is to interface with the device, then there will be some sort of user interface present).

12. With respect to claim 21, Moore disclosed at least one computer readable-medium containing computer program instructions for associating computer network identifications with network policies, said computer program instructions comprising the steps of: (column 17, lines 4-7), said method comprising the steps of: analyzing a network interface associated with a client computer using a plurality of network detectors (column 13, lines 28-34, 38-44, where the NLRSP is not a single entity, rather, it is a set of services that combined form the plurality of network detectors. Furthermore, analysis is required to perform the functions of the NLRSP), the detectors outputting a set of netspecs (column 14, lines 61-66, where the set of netspecs is the

GUID and the other information that applications frequently need), each netspec comprising a first token identifying a detector used for the analysis (column 14, lines 61-66, where the GUID is discovered by the first token according to the first token's description found in the applicant's specification on page 5) and a second token identifying the analyzed network interface (column 14, lines 61-66, where the other information is determined from the second token. Also, see column 16, lines 27-29, which shows that detecting an IP address is part of the NLRSP in accordance with the applicant's specification on page 5); associating the network identifications made by the netspecs with locations (column 13, lines 43-44) and feeding associated network identification/ locations pairs (column 13, lines 59-67 to column 14, line 1) to a network interface module to implement desired network policies (column 13, lines 28-34).

13. As for claim 22, Moore disclosed all of the limitations described in claim 1, including wherein the client computer has a plurality of network interfaces (column 17, lines 4-19, where an ICS policy is for a first interface and a corporate firewall policy is for a second interface) and further comprising: analyzing each of the plurality of network interfaces using the plurality of network detectors (column 16, lines 55-57, where determining connection types is analyzing network interfaces); and analyzing the netspecs for the plurality of network interfaces output by the plurality of network detectors to identify a set of unique network interfaces (column 16, lines 58-60, where resolving an internet name utilizes the netspecs obtained by the NLRSP); wherein interfaces in the set of unique network interfaces are associated with locations

Art Unit: 2151

responsive to the set of netspecs (column 16, lines 37-39, where the private side is the location).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

14 The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**15. Claims 2-3, 5-8, 11-13, and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore in view of Aaron (Pre-Grant Publication No. US 2004/0268150 A1).**

16. As for claim 2, Moore disclosed all of the limitations described in claim 1, including using a network interface module but did not explicitly state it consisting of one of a firewall, a router, a sniffer, and an intrusion detection module, a behavior blocking module, or a network communications module. However, Aaron did teach it consisting of one of a firewall, a router, a sniffer, and an intrusion detection module, a behavior blocking module, or a network communications module (0044, lines 5-7). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Moore, to use a firewall module, as taught by Aaron, as firewall technology was available and in common use at the time. Furthermore, utilizing firewall



technology would have been sought after to produce a safer computing environment in a viral computer age.

17. As for claim 3, Moore disclosed all of the limitations described in claim 1, but Moore did not explicitly state a user of the client computer adjusts firewall settings to set network policies. However, Aaron did teach a user of the client computer adjusts firewall settings to set network policies (0044, lines 4-7) based upon location (0042, lines 4-11, where the IP address is a location). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Moore, to utilize user settings in conjunction with firewalls, as taught by Aaron. At the time, many firewall systems, pop-up blockers, email filters, etc. allowed people to block specific addresses. Furthermore, utilizing firewall technology would have been sought after to produce a safer computing environment in a viral computer age.

18. As for claim 5, Moore disclosed all of the limitations described in claim 1, including the set of netspecs and data being based at least in part on the detectors that output the netspecs (column 13, lines 59-57 to column 14, line 1), but Moore did not explicitly state wherein the set is prioritized. However, Aaron did teach wherein the set is prioritized (0050, lines 20-23). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Moore, to utilize device prioritization, as taught by Aaron. At the time, doing so would have provided

Art Unit: 2151

more efficiency and customization to the system and ultimately providing a better user experience.

19. As for claim 6, the combination of Moore and Aaron taught all of the limitations described in claim 5. In addition, Aaron taught wherein a user of the client computer prioritizes the set of netspecs via a prioritization module (0050, lines 20-23).

20. As for claim 7, Moore taught all of the limitations described in claim 1, including wherein the step of associating the network identifications with locations comprises using a network probe (column 13, lines 59-67 to column 14, line 1) and the concept of the netspec (column 13, lines 59-67 to column 14, line 1). But Moore did not explicitly state doing so in conjunction with databases. However, Aaron did teach such a concept (0040, lines 29-36; 0044, lines 7-10). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Moore, to utilize device databases, as taught by Aaron. At the time, doing so would have provided more efficiency to the system and was in common use for data storage.

21. As for claim 8, the combination of Moore and Aaron taught all of the limitations described in claim 7 above. In addition, Moore taught wherein a user of the client computer modifies the netspec database via a location setting module (column 14, lines 52-56, The NLRSP modifies the database of netspecs by changing the location names of the netspecs. Furthermore, in the example given, the NLRSP names the location

helpingout.org when the client is volunteering at a local agency. The name helpingout.org signifies that the user modifies the database location names because the computer would not know that the human user was volunteering at a local agency unless explicitly told).

22. As for claim 11, Moore disclosed all of the limitations described in claim 10, including using a network interface module but did not explicitly state it consisting of one of a firewall, a router, a sniffer, and an intrusion detection module, a behavior blocking module, or a network communications module. However, Aaron did teach it consisting of one of a firewall, a router, a sniffer, and an intrusion detection module, a behavior blocking module, or a network communications module (0044, lines 5-7). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Moore, to use a firewall module, as taught by Aaron, as firewall technology was available and in common use at the time. Furthermore, utilizing firewall technology would have been sought after to produce a safer computing environment in a viral computer age.

23. As for claim 12, Moore disclosed all of the limitations described in claim 10, but Moore did not explicitly state wherein the network interface module is a firewall, and the network policies are implemented on a packet-by-packet basis. However, Aaron did teach wherein the network interface module is a firewall, and the network policies are implemented on a packet-by-packet basis (0040, lines 29-36). It would have been

Art Unit: 2151

obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Moore, to use a firewall module, as taught by Aaron, as firewall technology was available and in common use at the time. Furthermore, packet transmission is and was the standard form of transmission of networks.

24. As for claim 13, the combination of Moore and Aaron described all of the limitations described in claim 12 above. In addition, Aaron taught wherein locations are correlated with firewall settings on a distributed basis within the firewall (0042, lines 4-11, where the IP address is a location).

25. As for claim 15, Moore disclosed all of the limitations described in claim 10, including data being at least in part on the detectors that output the netspecs (column 13, lines 59-57 to column 14, line 1), but Moore did not explicitly state a prioritization module adapted to enable a user of the client computer to prioritize netspecs. However, Aaron did teach a prioritization module adapted to enable a user of the client computer to prioritize netspecs (0050, lines 20-23). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Moore, to utilize device prioritization, as taught by Aaron. At the time, doing so would have provided more efficiency and customization to the system and ultimately providing a better user experience.

26. As for claim 16, Moore disclosed all of the limitations described in claim 10, but Moore did not explicitly state a netspec database associating the netspecs with locations. However, Aaron did teach such a system (0040, lines 29-36; 0044, lines 7-10). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Moore, to utilize device databases, as taught by Aaron. At the time, doing so would have provided more efficiency to the system and was in common use for data storage.

27. As for claim 17, the combination of Moore and Aaron disclosed all of the limitations described in claim 16. In addition, Moore taught coupled to the netspec database, a location setting module adapted to enable a user of the client computer to associate the locations with the netspecs (column 13, lines 59-67 to column 14, lines 1).

### ***Response to Arguments***

28. Applicant's arguments filed 04/22/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

29. The majority of the applicant's arguments are addressed in the claim rejections as the claims have been amended on 04/22/2008. In addition, on page 8, the applicant argues that **"The Examiner argues that Moore teaches a set of netspecs at column 13, lines 59-67 to column 14, line 1. However, this portion of the reference merely describes 'a set formula' followed by the NLRSP when constructing names for**

**networks. The set of netspecs recited by the independent claims are the output of a plurality of detectors, not a formula followed by the detectors."** However, in searching the network for information, the system is required to have a device that is able to determine the nature of such information for which they are searching. Furthermore, the NLRSP is not an individual entity, but rather, it is a total embodiment of multiple entities (services containing detectors) as can be seen in column 13, lines 28-30.

### ***Conclusion***

**30. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **JOSEPH L. GREENE** whose telephone number is

Art Unit: 2151

(571)270-3730. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 9:00 AM to 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JLG

/John Follansbee/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2151